DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 696 SO 035 286

AUTHOR	Freyss, Siegrun Fox
TITLE	Learning Political Engagement from the Experts: Advocacy Groups, Neighborhood Councils, and Constituency Service.
PUB DATE	2003-08-00
NOTE	30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (99th, Philadelphia, PA, August 28-31, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advocacy; *Citizen Participation; Course Descriptions; Course Evaluation; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *Service Learning; *Social Action; Student Reaction; Student Surveys; *United States Government (Course)
IDENTIFIERS	California State University Los Angeles; *Political Action

ABSTRACT

This paper describes an uncommon approach to service learning. The students in a class at California State University Los Angeles are placed with experts of the political advocacy process, not with charitable nonprofits. Making use of a variety of organizations located in the greater Los Angeles region, the course offers students the opportunity to volunteer either (1) in the regional office of an interest group, (2) at the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment of the City of Los Angeles, or (3) in constituency service at the district office of an elected official. To demonstrate points of access to the political system to disaffected young people, the service-learning component is integrated in one section of the basic U.S. and state government course, a general education requirement for all college graduates in the state of California. The students' favorable ratings of the course when it was first offered in fall 2001 and in winter 2003 confirm the appropriateness of the approach. Service learning is supposed to encourage lifelong civic engagement. The results of a questionnaire given to students at the end of the quarter show overwhelming success in that respect. Of 24 students, 91.6% liked the course and would recommend it, or highly recommend it to others. Also, 79.2% were likely, or very likely, to do volunteer work in the future for the organization where they completed their service learning project, and 91.7% were likely, or very likely, to do volunteer work in the future for another organization. Includes 15 tables. Contains 15 references. Appended are a course syllabus and the survey questionnaire. (Author/BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 696

LEARNING POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT FROM THE EXPERTS: ADVOCACY GROUPS, NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS, AND CONSTITUENCY SERVICE

SO 035 286

Siegrun Fox Freyss, Ph. D.
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
California State University, Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032-8226

Tel. (323) 343-2238
Fax. (323) 343-6452
sfreyss@exchange.calstatela.edu
www.calstatela.edu/faculty/sfreyss/sfreyss.htm

Abstract:
This paper describes an uncommon approach to service learning. The students in my class are placed with experts of the political advocacy process, not with charitable nonprofits. Making use of the great variety of organizations located in the greater Los Angeles region, the course offers students the opportunity to volunteer either (1) in the regional office of an interest group, (2) at the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE) of the City of Los Angeles, or (3) in constituency service at the district office of an elected official. To demonstrate points of access to the political system to disaffected young people, the service-learning component is integrated in one section of the basic American and state government course, which is a general education requirement for all college graduates in the state of California.

The students' favorable ratings of the course when it was first offered in fall 2001 and then in winter 2003 confirms the appropriateness of the approach. Service learning is supposed to encourage life-long civic engagement, and the results of a questionnaire given to the students at the end of the quarter show overwhelming success in that respect. Of 24 students, 91.6 percent liked the course and would recommend it, or highly recommend it, to fellow students. Also, 79.2 percent were likely, or very likely, to do volunteer work in the future for the organization where they did their service learning project, and 91.7 percent were likely, or very likely, to do volunteer work in the future for another organization. Similarly favorable results were achieved when the course was offered a second time in winter 2003.

Prepared for delivery at the 2003 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, August 28-31, 2003.
Copyright by the American Political Science Association.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. F. Freyss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper describes a new, quite successful approach to service learning introduced in a lower-division, general education (GE) course in American and California state government. The project, first undertaken in the fall quarter 2001 and then again in winter 2003, involved advocacy organizations, a municipal citizen empowerment department, as well as the district offices of elected officials. The report explains the approach, evaluates the course based on survey responses, identifies reasons for its success, and points out some limits encountered. The paper is detailed and follows the tradition of Battistoni & Hudson (1997, p. 1) and others in sharing insights into the theory and practice of service learning in political science, so that advantages and limits of this form of experiential learning can be made transparent.[1]

After an activist start in the 60s and 70s, service learning in more recent years has, to a great extent, evolved into charitable, care-taking, mentoring, or tutoring work, as the testimonies by pioneers indicate (Stanton, Giles, and Cruz, 1999). High school and college students are asked to do volunteer work in nonprofit organizations to help needy children and adults. That is the "service" part of the service-learning mission. In political science courses the "learning" component is introduced by asking the students to reflect on the causes of poverty or of other deficiencies, to study the public policies that alleviate or fail to resolve the problems, and to device strategies advocating on behalf of the needy.

Service learning is different from internships, although overlapping objectives can occur. Internships are intended to prepare students for future employment and to provide some work experience to improve the students' chances of getting hired. In contrast, service learning is intended to prepare young people for their future role as responsible citizens as well as to generate a sense of community and a link to social groups the students might otherwise not come in contact with.

The wish to introduce students at the California State University, Los Angeles, to political institutions that may be beyond the students' cognitive horizon was the central reason for pursuing the pilot project. It demonstrated to the students three pathways citizens have to influence the political process and governmental action:

1. Organized interests;
2. government programs that bring city hall closer to the community, such as the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE), which is charged with overseeing the formation of more than 100 neighborhood councils covering all of the city of Los Angeles;
3. the district offices of elected officials.

A fourth pathway would be getting involved in election campaigns. But the service learning literature excludes partisan politics from service learning considerations, and this distinction was made clear to the students and to the elected officials who participated. I was very pleased to see that this line was respected. However, while explaining the distinction at the beginning of the quarter, I had told students that they, of course, could get involved in election campaigns on their own time, and I was happy to learn that some did.

Approaches to Service Learning in Political Science

In line with other social science fields, the prevailing community-service activity in political science has been charitable and educational work. A political dimension is often envisioned during periods of reflection, which can happen anytime, but are supposed to be nurtured by instructors during class discussions and by requiring students to keep a journal. Students are encouraged to reflect on the public policies that may have contributed to the problem or reduced it. Sometimes students are also asked during the reflection period to consider advocacy as a way of serving the needy.

The influential document *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning*, composed in 1989 at the Wingspread meeting, mentions a variety of possible charitable and educational activities. They range from tutoring at-risk youngsters to serving the homeless at soup kitchens. The document suggests the inclusion of a political dimension at the reflection stage. The text is subdivided into ten principles, and the second one reads: "An effective program provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience." The subsequent explanatory paragraph reads in part: "Through discussions with others and individual reflection on moral questions and relevant issues, participants can develop a better sense of social responsibility, advocacy, and active citizenship" (Honnet and Poulsen, 1989, p. 3). The Wingspread meeting and document may have set service learning on a path to care-taking programs that serve individuals, not political empowerment that strengthens principles and improves long-term practices. To be clear, I do not wish to see charitable work or child-development efforts replaced by political engagement. Instead, I would like to see a better balance between the two approaches when students' service learning projects are planned in the field of political science.

Recent data collected by the Campus Compact on nation-wide service learning approaches reflects the same bias toward charitable and developmental work. The Compact is a national coalition of more than 750 colleges and universities promoting community-campus partnerships. It has collected statistics from its member institutions that show the nature of service learning activities. The questionnaire lists 22-24 issue areas, depending on the year, and respondents are asked to check all those areas that are addressed by their campuses' service projects. Table 1

TABLE 1: ISSUE AREAS ADDRESSED BY SERVICE LEARNING PROJECTS (>50%)
(at campuses participating in Campus Compact survey)

Issue Area	1999	2000	2001
	%	%	%
1. Tutoring	82	92	91
2. Mentoring (Big Brother/Big Sister, etc.)	n/a	73	82
3. Housing/Homelessness	78	79	81
4. Environment	77	77	79
5. Hunger	70	72	73
6. Health	65	65	68
7. Women's Issues	63	65	68
8. Parenting/Child Care	57	56	56
9. Multicultural Issues	56	59	59

Source: Campus Compact (2002a)

shows the findings for issue areas with 50 percent or more entries in the last three years. Issue areas addressed by fewer than 50 percent of the service-learning projects are in descending order:

10. Sexual Assault
11. HIV/AIDS
12. Public Arts/Theater
13. Economic Development,
14. Immigrants/Migrant Workers,
15. Urban environment,
16. Voting Issues,
17. Community-based Research,
18. Mental Health,
19. Substance Abuse,
20. International,
21. Conflict Resolution,
22. Legal Aid.

Most of the 22 issue areas only tangentially introduce the student to the advocacy process or other civic involvement associated with active citizenship and direct, democratic engagement in the public sphere. A second limit of the approaches is the not-so-hidden class nature of the partnerships—middle-class students serving the poor. The class nature of most service learning projects is more obvious in Table 2, which shows the populations covered by the Campus Compact survey. The percentage refers to the proportion of projects that serve a particular population, with 100 percent being the total of all service-learning projects at the campuses participating in the survey.

TABLE 2: POPULATIONS SERVED BY SERVICE-LEARNING PROJECTS (at campuses participating in Campus Compact survey)

Populations	1999	2000	2001
	%	%	%
Low-income	n/a	83	89
Pre-school	n/a	65	64
Elementary	74	89	89
Junior High	n/a	77	80
High School	n/a	65	70
Minority	n/a	69	77
Elderly	67	77	74
Homeless	n/a	67	76
Developmentally Disabled	61	69	64
Physically Disabled	52	59	58
Non-English Speaking	n/a	53	62
Adults/Literacy/ESL	n/a	55	56
Incarcerated	28	32	32

Source: Campus Compact (2002a)

The tendency to target minorities or the needy as recipients of student volunteer activities is problematic at CSULA for two reasons. First, minorities are in the majority on the campus, and not all are poor. Indeed, the equation of minority status with poverty or illiteracy is resented by quite a few people for its stereotyping and condescending nature. Especially students who can afford to take the basic American and state government course at the university and not at a community college tend to have a middle class background. Second, many of our students do come from moderate-income communities and see the problems created by poverty on a daily basis. They need not spend precious college time learning about the issues or be prodded to deal with them in service-learning projects. For these reasons, I was looking for a service-learning experience that would be inclusive (Guarasci, Cornwell, and Associates, 1997, p. xiii) and simultaneously address a problem our students share with young adults across the country—their low level of interest in political issues (Bennet, 2000; Walker, 2000, p. 647).

Two Foundations are addressing the lack of public involvement directly. Scholars at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching have targeted undergraduate education as a possible sphere where young people can be prepared for "lives of moral and civic responsibility" (Colby et al., 2002), and the Foundation launched the Political Engagement Project (PEP) in spring 2002. It chose 21 campus projects from around the country that in various ways try to deal with political apathy among undergraduates. In a three-year collaborative effort, PEP will test what works and why (Carnegie, 2002). Campus Compact (2002b), with the support from the Pew Charitable Trusts, has initiated a two-year campaign mobilizing students to rebuild the democratic fabric of the American political system.

Political scientists have not always been helpful in re-energizing the students' political involvement. Indeed, the field is weakened in speaking truth to power by a split over its own proper methods and substance. One camp, which dominates the *American Political Science Review*, most disciplinary journals, and tenure decisions at many universities, wants political research to adhere to the logical-positivist tradition of quantitative, value-free, and disengaged scholarship. The other camp, whose voices can sometimes be heard in *PS: Political Science and Politics* and a small number of other outlets, supports action research that will provide the evidence and rationale for new policies.

The split has also affected the practice of service learning in political science courses, as Robinson (2000, p. 607) points out. One side sees service learning as charitable work and opposes politicizing the academy; while the other side insists that service learning should go beyond charity and teach "justice advocacy" as well as community action by actually engaging students in such projects. Both sides have to agree that the introduction of service-learning courses has provided the opportunity to reflect on existing pedagogy and ways to improve it to serve our student body better.

Learning while doing can be good pedagogy, but it requires time. One needs to ensure that there will be enough time for the community partner to reap some benefits from the service-learning collaboration. Instructors and students live by academic cycles, which may not coincide with successful political action. Students may parachute into an organization, create a lot of chaos, and disappear at the end of the semester. The quarter system, under which CSULA operates, compresses the time even more than the semester system.

Volunteering for established and successful interest groups, for a municipal neighborhood empowerment agency, or in the field offices of elected officials proved to be an excellent alternative to creating new projects. The participating community partners had ongoing programs that could receive a boost by the entry of the student volunteers. However, replicating this approach at other colleges or universities has its limits. It is primarily suited for large urban areas, where appropriate organizations are located in commuting distance.

PART I:
COURSE ORGANIZATION AND OUTCOMES

In retrospect, the organization of the course looks straightforward. But putting one's vision on paper, getting university approval, and finding appropriate community partners took some time. The process is described here in some detail for the benefit of instructors who may want to implement a similar approach. In the end, the success of the experimental course has been its best justification. The following sections cover the course when it was first introduced in fall quarter 2001. At the end of Part I, information and insights are added from the course when it was offered a second time in winter 2003.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

Months before the start of the first class in fall 2001, thirty-three entities operating in the greater Los Angeles area were contacted. Of them, 23 were "interest groups" in the sense used in the political science literature. Their web sites indicated that their work was divided between educating government officials and the public about the cause they advocated as well as serving their members and their target population directly in various ways. Most of the organizations were national in scope, with headquarters in Washington, D.C. Hispanas Organized for Political Equality (HOPE) operated primarily in California, and Mothers of East Los Angeles or Madres del Este de Los Angeles - Santa Isabel was of a local nature.

Nine district offices of federal or state elected officials were also contacted. They represented areas from which most of CSULA students were drawn. Finally, one newly created city agency, the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE), was added because of its mission to foster political engagement in the city of Los Angeles. For most of the 33 organizations, the contact information was obtained from their respective web sites.

The organizations received a letter summarizing the pilot project. The letter emphasized the common goal of the organization and the course—educating the next generation for active citizenship. The letter also emphasized that the collaboration may have synergistic benefits – that together we might be more effective in achieving our mission than operating separately. Long-term benefits were suggested, since the short-term volunteer work by itself may be experienced by the agency more as a disruption than a plus. The letter ended with two check-off boxes, where agencies could indicate (1) whether they were interested in participating and wanted to receive more information or (2) whether they did not wish to be involved at the present time.

Of the 33 possible community partners, 20 returned the first letter, and they received detailed information on the structure of the collaboration. Depending on the preference of the agency, students did their service work in teams or individually. The instructor provided the names of participating organizations and contact persons.

For various reasons, six organizations dropped out over time, leaving 14 agencies participating to the end. They are listed in Tables 3 and 4. For instructors considering a similar approach, it might be helpful to list the reasons for non-participation. Some entities:

- were too small and had no need for volunteers,
- had all the volunteers they could handle,
- were reorganizing their operations and could not handle new volunteers at that particular point in time,
- were serving a clientele whose confidentiality might be compromised by temporary volunteers.

Table 3:
Organizations Participating in Service-Learning Project in POLS 150-8, Fall Quarter 2001

1	American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
2	Anti-Defamation League (ADL)
3	Armenian Assembly of America
4	Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights
5	League of Women Voters
6	MAZON (A Jewish Response to Hunger)
7	MELA (Mothers of East Los Angeles or Madres del Este de Los Angeles-Santa Isabel)
8	Sierra Club

Table 4:
Public Officials Participating in Service-Learning Project in POLS 150-8, Fall Quarter 2001

1	The Honorable Senator Dianne Feinstein
2	The Honorable Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard
3	The Honorable State Senator Gloria Romero
4	The Honorable State Assembly Member Judy Chu
5	The Honorable State Assembly Member Jackie Goldberg
6	Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE), City of Los Angeles

The other organizations welcomed the student volunteers and took great pains to make the service a memorable learning experience, which is reflected in the overwhelmingly positive responses recorded in Tables 6 and 7. In most instances, the organizations were run by professionals and had experience in managing volunteers. Strong and caring mentors reduced the trial and error period, kept frustrations in check, and enabled students to be productive in a short period of time.

The community partners benefited in various ways from the collaboration. In some instances, students did general clerical work. In other cases, the organizations took advantage of the diversity the students brought to the work site—for instance, bilingual skills were helpful in creating informational flyers for distribution in immigrant communities, and when targeting high school youth, the volunteers could be used to draft age-appropriate messages.

PARTICIPATING STUDENTS

Because of the experimental nature of the project, the Department of Political Science agreed to limit the size of the class to approximately 25 students. From the onset, the course was widely advertised to ensure that students participated voluntarily. The university advisement center and the advisement centers of the six colleges received announcements to increase the likelihood that students were aware of the nature of the course when they signed up for it.

When early enrollment reached 35, the section was closed and all students received a letter from the Department chair explaining the service learning activities. The Department was offering nine sections of the POLS 150 course, and students could change sections freely before the start of classes. Seven students made use of that option. Limiting the class size is important to allow for proper individual support and oversight.

As is common in general-education classes, I did not know any of the students in the beginning and had to rely on the class roster to glean some information about the nature of the individuals who were willing to participate in the experiment. Table 5 shows the demographic distribution. Only one of the 28 students had declared political science as her major. This is noteworthy because the experiment apparently reached students who had no particular interest in government or politics. Raising their sense of political efficacy and demonstrating points of access to the political process were important course objectives.

Table 5:
Demographic Characteristics of Students in POLS 150-8, Fall Quarter 2001

Characteristics		Number of Students	%
Gender:	male	13	46.4
	female	15	53.6
Standing:	freshmen	12	42.9
	sophomores	8	28.6
	juniors	5	17.9
	seniors	3	10.7
Ethnicity:	Latino/a	18	64.3
	other	10	35.7
College:	Arts and Letters	5	17.9
	Business and Economics	4	14.3
	Education	1	3.6
	Engineering and Technology	3	10.7
	Health and Human Services	7	25.0
	Natural and Social Sciences	8	28.6
Overall class size		28	100

STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE

The course chosen for the service-learning project, POLS 150, Government and American Society, is part of a state-mandated requirement. All California college graduates are supposed to be knowledgeable about the U.S. Constitution as well as the California state and local government. It is a challenge to cover the material in one semester, and more so at universities

operating on the quarter system, which includes CSULA. The quarter gives the instructor ten weeks plus the finals week.

Including a service-learning component in a regular, general-education course requires finding a proper balance between time in the classroom, time in the field, and time for studying and reflection. Enough time has to be allotted to the fieldwork to give students the opportunity to observe and to learn, and enough time has to be dedicated to actual volunteer work to make it worthwhile for the community partner to participate. Then in the classroom, some minutes need to be set aside for students to report on their service activities as well as to share their reflections. But most of the time in the classroom should be devoted to the academic subject matter to do justice to the course material that has to be covered. On top of that, an interpretation of current events, for instance, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, is commonly integrated in an American government course.

The weekly schedule on p. 3 of the syllabus (See App. 1) shows the allocation of time over the ten weeks. Twenty-five hours are spent in the classroom, and an additional 18 hours are required to complete the service-learning component. Students also receive regular reading assignments, analyze newspaper articles, and record their field activities and reflections in a journal.

It is difficult to gauge whether it was 9/11 or the service-learning experience that heightened students' interest in government and political issues. Both factors probably raised awareness that made them eager and efficient learners. Research has linked length of service to effectiveness in terms of knowledge gained and attitudinal changes (Hepburn, Niemi, and Chapman, 2000, p. 619-620). But such research needs to look at particular student populations. Minorities, who have been denied political participation for several generations, and immigrants from oppressive political regimes may respond more favorably to the opportunity of getting a foot in the political door through a relatively short service-learning experience than the traditional white, middle class student. According to the survey administered in class, 43 percent of the students were born outside the United States.

HURDLES

Several challenges cropped up, but the students were quite resourceful in dealing with them. The students' initiative was very much appreciated; otherwise, the size of the class and the number of participating units would have made the project unmanageable. Among the problems were:

- wrong phone number or address listed on web site,
- lack of familiarity on the part of some students with the working world,
- high cost of parking downtown, on Wilshire Blvd., or in Santa Monica,
- organization not providing good mentorship,
- agency in the middle of the quarter not wanting to continue.

In the last case, when an agency dropped out of the arrangement in the middle of the quarter and a placement with another organization was not possible, the affected students were asked to write a briefing paper about the organization they had chosen.

The issue of liability needs to be clarified before the start of the class. The university may have a blanket insurance policy that covers off-campus student activities required in connection with a course. Alternately, students could be asked to sign a release form holding the university harmless in case of a claim. Established nonprofit organizations may have insurance policies that cover volunteers. Finally, some states, such as California, have laws that protect volunteers as long as they act in good faith (Oleck and Stewart, 1994, pp. 998-1002).

The nonprofit literature points out that organizations need to be as careful in selecting and training volunteers as they are with paid employees to avoid negligence claims (Freyss and Behrens, 1994). To help the nonprofits, students were encouraged to treat their placement as volunteers with as much care as they would in seeking paid employment. Students had to prepare a résumé and were told to expect to be interviewed before being accepted by the organization.

In their reflections, some students confessed that originally they had little knowledge of the working world. They lacked familiarity with office computers and proper telephone manners. This was especially crucial for students who worked in the district offices of elected officials, answering calls from constituents and helping them navigate the federal bureaucracy using online and offline resources. Some students also had to learn to dress professionally and to adapt themselves to an unfamiliar organizational culture.

Tracking and Assessment of Students' Field Work

Approximately one quarter of the students' final grade depended on the quality of their journal and on their performance at the organization where they did their service-learning project. The students' promptness in submitting their résumé to the organization and calling to arrange a work schedule was tracked by a form letter early in the quarter. The instructor could not accompany each student or team to their first meeting with the organization because of the size of the class and the large number of participating community partners.

To streamline the final evaluation, all organizations or mentors received a second form letter. The form consisted of two parts. First, it asked the agency to verify whether the student had completed the required 18 hours of service, and second, the mentor was asked to rate the student's performance on a three-point scale:
exceeded expectations ☐ met expectations ☐ was below expectations ☐

Of the 28 students in the fall 2001 class, 26 completed their service-learning project. Two students switched to writing a briefing paper when their organizations asked in the middle of the quarter to terminate the collaboration. In one case the student became ill and could not meet his volunteer commitments, and in the other case the organization had no activities for the student. Of the 26 individuals who completed their assignments, 20 or 76.9 percent exceeded performance expectations and 6 or 23.1 percent met expectations. No participant received a "below expectations" rating.

Self-selection may have contributed to the high ratings. Students had been informed before the start of the quarter about the nature of the service-learning project, and one can assume the more mature students were willing to participate in the pilot project.

Students' Assessment of the Course and Learning Outcomes

The students' support for the service-learning project confirms the appropriateness of the community involvement. Table 6 shows the result of questions given to the students at the end of the quarter. Of 24 students, 91.6 percent liked the course and would recommend it, or highly recommend it, to fellow students.

Table 6:
Students' Assessment of Course POLS 150-8, Fall Quarter 2001

Question	Recommend it highly	Recommend it	Will not recommend it	Total
If a POLS 150 class with the service-learning component is offered in the future, what would you tell fellow students who might be considering taking it?	17 70.8%	5 20.8%	2 8.3%	24 100%

Service learning is supposed to encourage life-long civic engagement, and the results presented in Table 7 show promise in that respect. Of 24 students, 79.2 percent were likely, or very likely, to do volunteer work in the future for the organization where they did their service-learning project. Moreover, 91.7 percent were likely, or very likely, to do volunteer work in the future for another organization. Some organizations, for instance the ACLU, provided such meaningful work that students stayed on over the winter holiday break to complete their projects.

Table 7:
Short-term, and Possible Long-Term, Outcome of the Service-Learning Experience

Questions	Very likely	Likely	Not likely	Total
Are you likely to do volunteer work in the future for the organization where you did your service-learning project?	9 37.5%	10 41.7%	5 20.8%	24 100%
Are you likely to do volunteer work in the future for another organization?	10 41.7%	12 50.0%	2 8.3%	24 100%

Individual testimony by participating students revealed specific benefits:

- A Latino student, working on a Latina Rights Project at the ACLU, learned about the value of statistical data gathering in support of legal claims.
- One student, a math major, had problems with a statistics class. When she mentioned this during her service-learning activity with the League of Women Voters, her mentor, a retired math teacher, tutored her with great success. As a result, the student felt she had gotten more from the League than she put in.
- A student, living in Boyle Heights, did not know that Mothers of East Los Angeles or Madres del Este de Los Angeles-Santa Isabel (MELA) maintained a community resource center a few blocks from his home.

- An African-American student also selected MELA as her organization, quietly wondering how she would be received by a Latina organization. Her experience was wonderful, and she realized that many community issues transcend particular ethnic groups.
- A Latino student chose ADL and learned about Jewish efforts to educate young persons about hate crimes as well as promote character education and a non-biased school environment.
- Students volunteering in the offices of federal elected officials learned first hand the consequences of the Anthrax attack. Because of the closure of offices in Washington, DC, and the evacuation of Senators and Members of the House to their home offices, students got to meet the officials and observe their hectic schedules firsthand.
- Students who chose the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE) for their service-learning project were introduced to neighborhood council formation efforts in their part of Los Angeles.

In journal entries and in reflection periods in class, respect emerged as an important issue. Students liked to work at organizations where their presence was acknowledged, where they were introduced to staff and other volunteers and invited to join lunch groups. Several of the participating organizations do advertise their internship and volunteer positions on all campuses in the region, including CSULA. But students from Occidental College, UCLA, and USC are apparently more likely to make use of the opportunities. The service-learning course provided the opportunity for CSULA students to join the area-wide corps of young, politically-engaged volunteers.

The Service-Learning Course in Winter Quarter 2003

Because of the success the first time around, few changes were made when the course was offered again in winter 2003. However, some adjustments had to be made later, for instance, a few organizations dropped out, while others came on board. The added community partners were:

- Asian Pacific American Legal Center (of Southern California),
- National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials,
- The Honorable Senator Barbara Boxer,
- The Honorable Congresswoman Hilda Solis.

In preparation for the next time when the course with the service-learning component will be taught, I plan to visit the local branches of some important civil rights groups that so far have declined to participate.

In addition to adjustments with the community partners, a change was made in tracking the students and receiving feedback from them. Once the placement of students got underway after the midterm exam, I distributed a form called "progress report" during each class period. On the form students indicated the starting date of their service-learning assignment and the number of hours completed. The students were also asked to assess the service-learning experience on a scale from (1) very satisfied, (2) satisfied, to (3) not satisfied, and the form had space to answer the following two questions:

1. What do (did) you like about your s-l experience?
2. What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?

This written feedback tool proved valuable and efficient in monitoring and mentoring the 25 students, who were spread out among ten different sites.

Student Satisfaction According To Progress Reports and Journals, Winter 2003

The satisfaction of students with their chosen community organization varied somewhat from week to week. For several class periods, the ratio of satisfaction hovered around one to two, with one third of the students being "very satisfied" and two thirds being "satisfied." Only occasionally was a student dissatisfied. Toward the end of the quarter, the proportion of students being "very satisfied" to "being satisfied" was nearly 50/50 with nobody expressing dissatisfaction. Two primary reasons for being satisfied or very satisfied emerged:

- The friendly reception the students received, and
- the insights the students gained about the political process.

Dissatisfaction revolved primarily around lack of mentoring, contact person not available, or boring work.

Here follow verbatim comments that students wrote down in response to the question *"What do (did) you like about your s-l experience?"*

"I like the people that I work with and the environment I am in. Everyone accepted me right after they met me, and showed me nothing but kindness. I also like the cause: To keep youth off the street." This student had nothing negative to say about her service experience.

"They treat us as part of the team. They are very friendly and helpful when it comes to answering questions." This student did not have anything negative to say about her placement either. Indeed, in response to the question "What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?" she put down: "Nothing, it was all fine. So fine they want us back to do community service."

Her team member made a similar comment: "It was a great experience working with the organization, they liked our work so much they want us to go in the summer."

"I liked that I was actually a full participant. I had many different duties." But there was also this: "I did not like that I had to hunt down my contact to provide me with details on my second volunteering day. There was a breakdown in communication."

"The full time staff at Congresswoman ... office is very supportive and awesome. I am learning a lot about political processes." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "The office can be a bit tedious, but political work and dedication is very important. It is very rewarding and well worth it."

"Schedule was flexible, friendly environment, and close to home. No work deadline or pressure." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "Working in a job where I am not interested because it is not my career goal." This comment gave me the opportunity to point out the distinction between an internship, which provides preparation for the working world, and service learning, which is supposed to prepare participants for responsible citizenship.

"I really like the people I'm working with and I think the organization is a good one. It's been fun to get involved so far." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* There isn't anything I don't really like about this experience. It's productive and enjoyable."

"I like helping constituents resolve their problems and also I like participating in the political system." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "I don't like administration work as much..." It seems like the pol. system is slow."

"I love the work I do and also the people who I work with." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "Got nothing to say but probably the parking situation!"

"I got a real hands on experience with how our political system works." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "I only had one problem and that was with the press secretary. She was just too controlling."

"I learned a great deal of office work as well as problems with new legislation." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* I did not get the opportunity to meet with the Congresswoman."

"The people at the office are nice and helpful. The first day I was there they explained to me what they do there in the office." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "The only work I do is photocopying and looking for scholarships on-line. I don't mind the work but I do feel I am doing more service than learning."

"I enjoy contacting the council members. They are always very polite and enthusiastic. I think its great that they take time and take an active participation in their community."

"I got to work with all types of Asian, since I grew up in a Hispanic area." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "Things were not as exciting as I wanted them to be."

"Hearing what the discussion were about at the … candidate forum." *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?* "Going to … was extremely boring." "They didn't schedule enough hours for me."

The few students who emphasized the negative aspects of their service-learning experience had this to say. *What do (did) you not like about your s-l experience?*:

"I arrived at the office, and she was not there. I could not contact her as well. I will try to work more on Tuesday." But then at the next evaluation the student was satisfied: "Very easy to do." And he was happy that he did not have to deal with irate voters.

"I still do not see the connection between class and my volunteer work. I have to help set up a girl scouts troop. I also met with another organization and somehow I am now going to conduct a workshop."

Time schedule – only available on weekdays, have to cancel work in order to volunteer." Of course, this student should not have signed up for the course. The time commitment was made clear the first day in class and also explained in the syllabus. Furthermore students were told which sections of POLS 150, Government and American Society, were still open. But the subsequent week, the mood of the student had turned to satisfaction: *What do (did) you like about your s-l experience?* "Willing to take any schedule we gave, allowed us to change schedule, friendly environment, no work deadline, employees always complimenting us."

In my view, the subtext of respect and acceptance that many students voice in their comments is an indication of the success of the service-learning component. As mentioned in the beginning, the purpose of the fieldwork is to introduce students to various points of access to the political system and to foster life-long civic engagement. By having a good or very good service-learning experience, students are likely to continue that practice into the future, what several students indeed indicated they would do. Moreover, learning political engagement from the experts apparently reduces disaffection and brings government closer to the young people.

The journal entries echo the statements students made in their weekly progress reports. Each entry in the journal was supposed to consist of at least two paragraphs, one describing the service or work the students did for the community partner and the other one containing the learning component in the form of reflections and insights. The latter paragraph, or a third one, was also supposed to draw connections between the organization's activities and the concepts students learned in class about the American political system. Some class members did not see the relationship in the beginning, but they were willing to struggle with the idea and over time their observations became more sophisticated.

Implications

It appears that students accepted the service learning challenge because they could see how political and governmental actions helped, or could help, their own communities as well as the public in general. Some students were so eager to spread the word on environmental preservation that they leafleted the class. Others were happy to participate in the creation of a CD that informed high school students about the nature and negative consequences of hate crimes. A third team took its charge quite seriously finding ways to inform needy car owners about a new state program offering low-cost car insurance. People volunteering in the offices of elected officials showed dedication in helping constituents getting results from unresponsive administrative agencies. There was no political apathy among these students, apparently because

their projects were challenging and meaningful. I have to agree with Liu's (1996, p. 6) observation that young people at the present time are as idealistic as young people in previous generations and that they will express their values when given the opportunity to do so.

The process was also important. Some students learned to interact with members from different religious or cultural communities and recognized the similarities, leading to a feeling of inclusiveness and shared experiences. Others were pleased to see the self-help efforts and initiatives taken by elders in their neighborhoods to raise the quality of life. Observing these role models and their political effectiveness energized the young to actions of their own.

Hopefully, the benefits that the students in the first two classes received can be repeated and become a consistent outcome in the future. Success is not guaranteed. The organization, the student, and the instructor have to pull together to achieve results that will generate feelings of political efficacy and will realize the vision of sustained civic engagement that theories of service learning seek.

It also deserves repeating that the service-learning approach in this basic American government course has an important limitation. It is primarily suited for relatively large urban areas. They will have field offices of a size that will make service attractive while learning about political involvement. Smaller communities may have chapters with more or less regular meetings, but the chapters are not likely to manage sizeable projects that offer a glimpse into the workings of the larger political system and that would invite ongoing political engagement.

The next part reports on the findings from the quasi-experimental research design involving the fall '01 class, followed by a paragraph on the survey used in the winter '03 section.

PART II:
THE QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH DESIGN USED IN FALL '01

The scholarship on service learning is not only interested in student satisfaction and likely future civic engagement, but also in other opinion or behavior changes associated with political maturation and responsible citizenship in a democracy. One survey instrument with a pretest and posttest version was developed for the pilot course in fall quarter 2001. The winter 2003 class received a pretest/posttest questionnaire developed by the Office of the Chancellor of the California State University System. As a result, unfortunately, the outcome assessment data for the two courses are not at all comparable.

METHOD

A quasi-experimental research design with comparison group was chosen to assess the impact of the field experience on students' political behavior and perception of effective tools to influence government. As comparison group, the students of another daytime section of POLS 150 were given the same questionnaire. However, the comparison has its limits, since the two groups were not similar, at least not in terms of their demographic characteristics, as is summarized in Table 8. In course section 8, the experimental group, the ratio of male to female students was quite

even, 46.7 to 53.3 percent. In contrast, the ratio of male to female in section 7, the comparison group, was 29.1 to 70.9 percent, but these differences were not statistically significant. In terms of age, the comparison group was younger and the difference was statistically significant. The two classes also differed with respect to party affiliation. The experimental group leaned more toward the Democratic party to a statistically significant extent.

The demographic differences of the students in the two classes limit the usefulness of Section 7 as a comparison group. Moreover, differences in teaching style, textbooks used, and other influences raise internal-validity questions. This means, differences in political engagement between the two classes over the course of the quarter may not only be due to the exposure of the experimental group to the service-learning experience, but also due to these other factors. Selection effect and sample mortality are additional threats to internal validity. Since Section 8 students had the option of transferring to a different section of the course, the remaining students were self-selected and perhaps not comparable to the students in Section 7.

Table 8: Demographic Characteristics of Experimental Group (Sec. 8) and Control Group (Sec. 7) at the Start of the Quarter

	Section 8 % N=30	Section 7 % N=55	Sig.
Gender			
male	46.7	29.1	.11
female	53.3	70.9	
Age			
less than 21 years	61.5	86.0	.03
21-25	34.6	10.0	
more than 25 years	3.8	4.0	
Ethnic Background			
African American	3.3	10.0	
Asian American	10.0	20.0	
Euro American	6.7	2.0	.18
Latino/a	70.0	54.0	
Multi-ethnic/Other	10.0	14.0	
Born in the USA			
yes	56.7	61.1	.69
no	43.3	38.9	
Party Affiliation			
strong Democrat	21.4	6.1	
moderate Democrat	53.6	46.9	
independent	21.4	28.6	.00
moderate Republican	3.6	18.4	
strong Republican	0.0	0.0	

Another methodological problem arose with respect to the panel nature of the research design. In a panel study one tracks changes in individual responses between pretest and posttest. To preserve the students' anonymity, while enabling the matching of their answers on the pretest and posttest, the students were asked to enter their PIN number, which they use for registration.

However, in both sections students failed to understand the importance of entering the same PIN number on the pretest and posttest, and only a few posttest numbers could be matched with pretest numbers. Matches were then obtained by comparing students' demographic characteristics, but only 18 cases in the experimental group and 28 cases in the comparison group

were useable in the end. (I avoided using the last four digits of the social security number, since it would have destroyed the students' anonymity.) Because of the small size of the samples and the validity issues, the following comparison of the two groups with respect to changes in political behavior and assumptions over the quarter is problematic and the findings have to be used with caution.

Despite the methodological limits, the impact of the service-learning experience on political behavior and opinions is worth exploring considering that various assessment tools are presently being tested by service learning scholars. Pedagogical innovations have to show convincing improvements in students' sense of political efficacy to justify the continued adoption of the innovation.

Analysis of Changes over the Quarter

1. Question: On Association Membership

H_0: At the time of the posttest, i.e., at the end of the quarter, there is no difference between the students in the two classes concerning their membership in an association.

H_1: Section 8 students are more likely to have switched from no to yes at the time of the posttest.

Table 9: Member of an Association—Change from Pretest to Posttest*

	Section 8 (with S-L)		Section 7 (no S-L)	
	No.	%	No.	%
From yes to no	1	5.6	1	3.6
No change	13	72.2	26	92.9
From no to yes	4	22.2	1	3.6
Total	18	100.0	28	100.0

* Differences between class sections not statistically significant.

The crosstabulation of the pretest responses showed little difference between the two groups in terms of their membership affiliation, 13.3 percent and 11.1 percent. As presented in Table 9, the changes at the time of the posttest are not statistically significant either, but the percentages of the experimental group and comparison group show substantial differences in the hypothesized direction, 22.2 percent and 3.6 percent respectively. (For the complete question, please see the survey instrument in App. 2.)

2. Question: Considered Joining an Association

H_0: At the time of the posttest, there is no difference between the two classes in having considered joining an association.

H_1: Section 8 students are more likely to have switched from no to yes on this question at the time of the posttest.

Again, at the time of the pretest, the two groups did not differ substantially in the degree to which they belonged to an association, 24.0 percent and 19.1 percent respectively. The finding of the posttest is in the expected direction, as presented in Table 10, and one can conclude, albeit

with caution considering the size of the samples, that the service-learning experience raised the students' interest in association membership.

Table 10: Student Considered Joining an Association—Change from Pretest to Posttest*				
	Section 8 (with S-L)		Section 7 (no S-L)	
	No.	%	No.	%
From yes to no	0	0.0	3	13.6
No change	6	54.5	17	77.3
From no to yes	5	45.5	2	9.1
Total	11	100.0	22	100.0
* Differences between sections statistically significant; $p < .05$				

3. Question: Written to an Elected Official

H_o: At the end of the quarter, there is no difference between the two classes concerning their communication with elected officials.

H_1: Section 8 students are more likely to have written to elected officials by the end of the quarter.

Table 11: Student Has Written to Elected Official—Change from Pretest to Posttest*				
	Section 8 (with S-L)		Section 7 (no S-L)	
	No.	%	No.	%
From yes to no	1	5.6	1	4.3
No change	8	44.4	24	85.7
From no to yes	9	50.0	3	10.7
Total	18	100.0	28	100.0
* Differences between sections statistically significant; $p < .01$				

At the time of the pretest, the two classes were quite similar, 16.7 percent and 11.1 percent, but by the end of the quarter the percentage differed to a statistically significant extent (See Table 11). This allows us to accept the research hypothesis that the service-learning experience increased the students' likelihood of writing to elected officials.

4. Question: Attended City Hall Meeting

H_o: At the end of the quarter, there is no difference between the two classes concerning their visits to city hall.

H_1: Section 8 students are more likely to have switched from no to yes on this question.

Table 12: Student Has Attended City Hall Meeting—Change from Pretest to Posttest*				
	Section 8 (with S-L)		Section 7 (no S-L)	
	No.	%	No.	%
From yes to no	1	5.6	1	3.7
No change	11	61.1	25	92.6
From no to yes	6	33.3	1	3.7
Total	18	100.0	27	100.0
* Differences between sections statistically significant; $p < .05$.				

At the time of the pretest, a smaller number of experimental group students had visited city hall than comparison group students, 13.3 percent versus 22.6 percent. But this difference was wiped out at the time of the posttest (See Table 12). If this trend holds up in future surveys, it would signal a very desirable outcome. It would demonstrate that the service-learning experience brings city hall closer to the students – and by extension, raises the students' sense of political efficacy.

5. Question: Effectiveness of Campaign Contributions

H_o: At the end of the quarter, there is no difference between the two classes concerning their perception of the effectiveness of a $1,000 campaign contribution in influencing government and politics.

H_1: Section 8 students are more likely to have switched toward increased effectiveness on this question.

Table 13: Student's Perception of Effectiveness of Giving $1,000 to Political Candidate—Change from Pretest to Posttest*

	Section 8 (with S-L)		Section 7 (no S-L)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Decreased	7	38.9	3	10.3
No change	7	38.9	13	44.8
Increased	4	22.2	13	44.8
Total	18	100.0	29	100.0

* Differences between sections statistically significant; $p<.05$.

The outcome, shown in Table 13, is somewhat surprising. One would have expected that the field experience would have shown the students the importance of money in politics. But other influences, such as instructors and textbooks, can lead to alternative outcomes.

6. Question: Effectiveness of Money Given by Interest Groups

H_o: At the end of the quarter, there is no difference between the two classes concerning their perception of the effectiveness of money given by interest groups in influencing government and politics.

H_1: Section 8 students are more likely to have switched toward increased effectiveness on this question.

Table 14: Student's Perception of Effectiveness of Money Given by Interest Groups—Change from Pretest to Posttest*

	Section 8 (with S-L)		Section 7 (no S-L)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Decreased	5	27.8	3	10.7
No change	8	44.4	9	32.1
Increased	5	27.8	16	57.1
Total	18	100.0	28	100.0

* Differences between sections statistically significant; $p<.05$.

At the time of the pretest, there was no difference between the two groups. But at the end of the quarter, the trend findings did not support the research hypothesis. Indeed, more of the

comparison group students saw money given by interest groups as effective than the students in the experimental group (See Table 14).

7. Question: Effectiveness of Interest Group Lobbying

H_o: At the end of the quarter, there is no difference between the two classes concerning their perception of the effectiveness of lobbying by interest groups in influencing government and politics.

H_1: Section 8 students are more likely to have switched toward increased effectiveness on this question.

At the beginning of the quarter, the students in both classes held the same views on the power of lobbying. By the time of the posttest, however, the experimental group increased its favorable judgment substantially, as seen in Table 15. Based on the significance level one can reject the null hypothesis and argue that the service-learning experience increased the students' belief in the effectiveness of interest group lobbying.

Table 15:
Student's Perception of Effectiveness of Lobbying by Interest Groups—Change from Pretest to Posttest*

	Section 8 (with S-L)		Section 7 (no S-L)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Decreased	1	5.6	7	25.0
No change	7	38.9	13	46.4
Increased	10	55.6	8	39.1
Total	18	100.0	28	100.0

* Differences between sections statistically significant; $p<.02$.

The Survey Conducted in the Winter 2003 Class

In contrast to the statistically significant changes from pretest to posttest observed in the case of the fall '01 class, the questionnaire used in winter '03 did not yield any statistically significant results. The survey instrument had been developed by the service-learning coordinator, Office of the Chancellor, California State University System (See App. 2). Since the respondents' identification in the form of five digits of the social security number had been removed before faculty got the dataset, a matching of individual responses was not possible. The comparing of means or t-test was the only alternative, but no statistically significant differences between the means of the pretest and the posttest responses could be obtained. One flaw in the data may be the different size of the class. Twenty-two students participated in the pretest, but only 13 in the posttest.[2]

This lack of change is in marked contrast to the personal, social, political, and intellectual maturation the students apparently experienced as the result of their service-learning activities. The weekly progress reports and the journal entries document these positive changes implicitly and explicitly in the students' own words. A closer analysis of the methods used in assessing service-learning outcomes may therefore be appropriate. Open-ended questions may yield

different responses from closed questions, and a 10-point scale may elicit a different score from a 3-point scale.

---

[1] All documentation generated in connection with the course is available upon request.

[2] There is a rather mundane reason for the low participation rate at the time of the posttest. The journal was due on that day, and many students drifted in after the completion of the posttest survey.

References

Battistoni, R. M. & Hudson, W. E. (Eds.). (1997). *Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Political Science*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Bennett, S. E. (2000). "Political Apathy and Avoidance of News Media Among Generations X and Y: America's Continuing Problem." In S. Mann & J. J. Patrick (Eds.). *Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies, Indiana University.

Campus Compact (2002a). "Campus Compact Annual Service Statistics 1999, 2000, 2001." Retrieved October 23, 2002 from the World Wide Web: http://www.compact.org/newscc/.

Campus Compact (2002b). "Student Civic Engagement Campaign." Retrieved October 23, 2002 from the World Wide Web: http://www.compact.org/students/.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "Political Engagement Project." Retrieved Oct. 24, 2002: http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/PEP/.

Colby A., Ehrlich T., Beaumont, E., and Stephens, J. (2002). *Educating Citizens. Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freyss, S. F. & Behrens, P. I. (May 1, 1994). "Volunteers require more than amateur status." *PA Times 17*, 5, pp. 1-2.

Guarasci, R., Cornwell, G. H. & Associates (Eds.). (1997). *Democratic Education in an Age of Difference. Redefining Citizenship in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Honnet, E. P. & Poulsen, S. J. (1989). *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning*. Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation. Retrieved Oct. 22, 2002 from the World Wide Web: http://www.servicelearning.org/library/online_documents/good_practice.html.

Liu, G. (1996). "Origins, Evolution, and Progress: Reflections on the Community Service Movement in American Higher Education, 1985-1995." In R. Battistoni & K. Morton (Eds.). *Community Service in Higher Education. A Decade of Development. Providence*, RI: Feinstein Institute for Public Service, Providence College.

Oleck, H. L. (1994). *Nonprofit corporations, organizations, & associations*, 6th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Robinson, T. (2000). "Service Learning as Justice Advocacy: Can Political Scientists Do Politics?" *PS: Political Science & Politics 33*, 3 (September), pp. 605-612.

Stanton, T. K., Giles, D. E., & Cruz, N.I. (1999). *Service learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, T. (2000). "The Service/Politics Split: Rethinking Service to Teach Political Engagement." *PS: Political Science & Politics 33*, 3 (September), pp. 647-649.

APPENDIX 1

SYLLABUS OF POLS 150-08

GOVERNMENT AND AMERICAN SOCIETY

POLS 150 **Sec. 08** **4 units** **T/R 1:30-3:10 pm** **KH C4070**	**SYLLABUS** **GOVERNMENT AND AMERICAN SOCIETY**	**Dr. Siegrun Fox Freyss** **Associate Professor** **E&T A516** **Office hrs. TR 4-6 pm** **Tel. (323) 343-2238**
Fall Quarter 2001		**sfreyss@exchange.calstatela.edu** **www.calstatela.edu/faculty/sfreyss/sfreyss.htm**

Course Contents

This course provides an overview over the major political institutions, processes, and principles associated with the American federal government and California state government. The course covers the historical development, constitutional framework, three branches of government, voting, elections, interest groups, media, theories of political power, as well as issues of diversity both at the national level and in California. The course satisfies the state mandate to educate all California college students in the U.S. Constitution and state government. It also is a basic requirement of the GE program and the foundation for the political science major.

Service Learning

In addition to the traditional course contents, this section of POLS 150 includes a service learning component. This means:

- The in-class learning is supplemented with community service in the form of work in an advocacy organization or in the field office of an elected official.
- Students will form teams of two or three individuals and select an organization from the list provided. Please note:
  - Agencies on the list with a **YES/Y** have agreed to participate.
  - Agencies with a **YES** originally expressed interest, but have not yet responded to my second letter.
  - **NO** means, agency declined to participate.
  - None of the above means agency has not responded to first mailing.
- The service learning activity starts on Oct. 4 and ends Nov. 8. Other starting and completion dates are acceptable, but require mine and the agency's approval.
- Students are asked to keep a journal, in which you record your service-learning activities and observations.

Overall 18 hours of the in-class and study time are devoted to service learning. As the term implies, service learning does not only mean "service," but also "learning." This is achieved by reflecting on the larger meaning of advocacy work and constituency service in the context of the American political system and civic culture. You will be asked to share your observations and insights with your class mates, using the concepts and theories learned in the course. **Please maintain a professional demeanor at all times. Especially do not gossip about your agency and the people with whom you come in contact.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Course Objectives

1. To provide information about the government of the United States and California (informative component).
2. To help students learn the concepts and theories with which to analyze the political institutions and processes at the federal and state levels (conceptual and analytical component).
3. To enable students to evaluate information about political issues critically (critical component).
4. To encourage students to think constructively about political developments (creative component).
5. To enable students to participate in public affairs in an informed and responsible manner (moral component).

At a more practical level, the aim of the course is:

- To encourage life-long learning about government and politics by making the political news more transparent.
- To encourage life-long participation in politics.
- The service-learning component in particular is supposed to promote a sense of political empowerment and encourage future civic engagement.

Required Books

Lawrence, David. *America. The Politics of Diversity* Belmont, CA: West/Wadsworth, 1999.

Gerston, Larry N. and Terry Christensen. *California Politics and Government. A Practical Approach.* 6th ed. Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publ., 1997.

Recommended Activities

- Reading articles in newspapers and news magazines about the issues covered in class;
- watching the News Hour with Jim Lehrer on KCET at 6 pm;
- also on KCET, Washington Week in Review on Friday evening at 8:00 pm;
- on Adelphia cable, Week in Review and other programs;
- other in-depth coverage of political affairs.

Class Format

Some of the course material will be presented in lecture form. But the class is sufficiently small that much of the learning can occur through questions and answers and in the form of discussions. For this format to be enjoyable and to succeed, students have to keep up with the required reading, plus follow current political developments by reading a daily newspaper and watching appropriate TV programs.

Grading Procedure

The final letter grade, including +/- sign, will be based on:

1. In-class midterm exam: short-answer questions involving a newspaper article and the required reading (open book, open notes), about 25%;
2. In-class final exam: same as midterm, about 25%;
3. Evaluation by service-learning organization and journal, about 25%;
4. Class attendance and participation, about 25%.

Test material will come from the required reading and class lectures. Make-up exams will be granted for valid excuses, but documentation is required.

For students with protected disabilities, CSLA provides certain accommodations. Please see me during my office hours to request such an accommodation. Further information may also be obtained from the *General Catalog. Cal State LA 1999-2001*, pp. 78-79. To receive information about possible certification, contact the Office of Students with Disabilities, Student Affairs 115, Tel. (213) 343-3140, TDD 3139.

Resources for Study and Research

- NIS Account: To use the on-campus computer capabilities or dial in via a modem, students need to get a so-called NIS account, available in King Hall D140.
- Comprehensive Study Guide: <www.iss.stthomas.edu/studyguides>.
- Writing Manual: Hacker, Diana. *A Pocket Style Manual*, 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford Books, 1999.
- Search engine: www.google.com
- Government web sites: Federal <www.whitehouse.gov>
  State <www.ca.gov>
  Local <www.lacity.org> and <www.co.la.ca.us>

Weekly Schedule

Week	Day	Date & Time	Assignment	Topics
1.	Thu	Sept. 20; 1:30-3:10 pm		Course introduction
2.	Tue	Sept. 25; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Chs. 1-2	Foundations of the American
	Thu	27; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Chs. 3-4	Government
3.	Tue	Oct. 2; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Chs. 5-6	Political Participation & Media
	Thu	**4; 1:30-4:30 pm**	Journal Entry	**Service-learning work**
4.	Tue	Oct. 9; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Ch. 7	Polit. Parties & Interest Groups
	Thu	**11; 1:30-4:30 pm**	Journal Entry	**Service-learning work**
5.	Tue	Oct. 16; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Ch. 8	Polit. Behavior & Elections
	Thu	**18; 1:30-4:30 pm**	Journal Entry	**Service-learning work**
6.	Tue	Oct. 23; 1:30-3:10 pm	In-class	Midterm exam
	Thu	**25; 1:30-4:30 pm**	Journal Entry	**Service-learning work**
7.	Tue	Oct. 30; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Ch. 9	The Congress
	Thu	**Nov. 1; 1:30-4:30 pm**	Journal Entry	**Service-learning work**
8.	Tue	Nov. 6; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Chs. 10-11	The Presidency & Bureaucracy
	Thu	**8; 1:30-4:30 pm**	Journal Entry	**Service-learning work**
9.	Tue	Nov. 13; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Ch. 12	The Judiciary
	Thu	15; 1:30-3:10 pm	L, Ch. 13	Civil Liberties & Civil Rights
10.	Tue	Nov. 20; 1:30-3:10 pm	G & C, Chs. 1-4	Calif. Politics – Past & Present
	Thu	22; 1:30-3:10 pm		**Thanksgiving Holiday**
11.	Tue	Nov. 27; 1:30-3:10 pm	G & C, Chs. 5-7	Calif. Political Institutions
	Thu	29; 1:30-3:10 pm	G & C, Chs. 8-10	Local Government & IGR
12.	**Thu**	**Dec. 6; 1:30-4:00 pm**	**In-class**	**Final exam**

APPENDIX 2
QUESTIONNAIRES

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

Department of Political Science

Journal

for Service Learning Project at
[Agency]

Supervisor/Mentor: [Name, Title]

[Your Name]

Other Team Members:
[Their Names]

POLS 150, Sec. 08
Government and American Society
Instructor: Dr. Siegrun Fox Freyss
Fall Quarter 2001

Los Angeles, CA

POLS 150, Sec.____ **Government and American Society** **Fall '01**
Pretest Questionnaire **Dr. S. Fox Freyss**

Your chosen PIN ☐☐☐☐ (Please remember it, so that you can enter it on the posttest questionnaire.)

Answering this questionnaire is voluntary, and it is your right not to answer any or all the questions below. The questionnaire is not a test and will not be used to compute your grade. Since the survey is given in several sections of POLS 150, please enter the section of your class above. To preserve your anonymity, please do not write your name on the questionnaire. However, in order for me to match your answers on the pretest at the beginning of the quarter with your answers on the posttest given at the end of the quarter, you are asked to enter a personal identification number. The aggregate results may be used in research papers. Thank you for your help.

1. Are you a dues-paying member of an association, also called a membership organization, or interest group (e.g. a union or civil rights organization): yes ☐ no ☐ don't know ☐

1.1 If no, have you considered joining one: yes ☐ no ☐

2. Have you done any of the following:

a)	registered to vote	yes ☐	no ☐
b)	voted	yes ☐	no ☐
c)	written, called, or sent an e-mail to an elected official	yes ☐	no ☐
d)	given money to a political candidate	yes ☐	no ☐
e)	worked as volunteer in an election campaign	yes ☐	no ☐
f)	participated in a political demonstration	yes ☐	no ☐
g)	attended a city hall meeting or other political meeting	yes ☐	no ☐
h)	volunteered for a charitable organization (e.g. food bank)	yes ☐	no ☐

3. Some demographic information about yourself:

a) gender: male ☐ female ☐ **b)** your age:_____

c) ethnicity: African American ☐ Asian American ☐ Euro American ☐ Latino/a ☐
multi-ethnic ☐ Native American ☐ other (please specify): _____

d) Were you born in the U.S.: yes ☐ no ☐ **e)** If no, how many years have you lived in the U.S.: _____

4. Politically, do you consider yourself:

a strong Democrat	moderate Democrat	an Independent	a moderate Republican	strong Republican
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. How closely did you follow the news (before the Sept. 11 tragedies):

	regularly	occasionally	seldom	never
watched national network news (ABC, CBS, etc)				
watched local network news (ABC, CBS, etc)				
watched the news on CNN				
followed the news on PBS				
listened to national public radio				
read the Los Angeles Times				
read news magazines				
discussed politics with family members or friends				
other (please specify)				

6..1 Some educational information about yourself:

freshman ☐ sophomore ☐ junior ☐ senior ☐ graduate student ☐

6.2 Which college: AL ☐ BE ☐ ED ☐ ECT ☐ HHS ☐ NSS ☐ Undeclared ☐

7. To influence government and politics, how effective do you think are the following activities:

Activity	very effective	effective	may be/ may be not	ineffective	very ineffective
sending a letter/e-mail to an elected official					
giving $1000 to a political candidate					
volunteering in an election campaign					
joining an interest group that gives money to certain political candidates					
voting					
participating in a letter/e-mail writing campaign to influence the vote of an elected official					
being a member of an interest group that lobbies for certain public policies					

Thank you very much. Please give the questionnaire to your instructor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

SO 035286

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Learning Political Engagement from the Experts: Advocacy Groups, Neighborhood Councils, and Constituency Service	
Author(s): Siegrun Fox Freyss	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Siegrun Fox Freyss	Printed Name/Position/Title: Siegrun Fox Freyss, Assoc. Prof.
Organization/Address: Calif. State Univ LA	Telephone: (323) 343-2238 FAX: (323) 343-6452
	E-Mail Address: sfreyss@exchange.calstatela.edu Date: 9/23/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)